

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 is amended herein and new claim 13 is added.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 and 13 are currently pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER ZULIAN ET AL. (US 5,701,413) IN VIEW OF WATANABE (US 5,260,951)

In claim 1 (as amended herein) of the present invention, each of the modules includes "a plurality of error detection/correction code generation code generation circuits" and "a plurality of error detection/correction circuits."

The Examiner alleges that Zulian et al. ("Zulian") shows an error detection/correction system in data transmission between a plurality of modules that connected via bus 17 in a controller, the system including a plurality of error detection/correction code generation circuits and a plurality of error detection/correction circuits in column 4, lines 16-48 and column 13, lines 43-47.

However, Zulian discloses a plurality of processors 1, 2, 3, and 4 that are connected to bus 17. The processors 1, 2, 3, and 4 are not error detection/correction code generation circuits or error detection/correction circuits nor is it disclosed anywhere in Zulian, particularly in column 4, lines 16-48 and column 13, lines 43-47, that the processors have a difference in at least one of an inspection bit length, an information bit length, and a correction capacity. The processors 1, 2, 3, and 4 also do not correspond to a respective one of the error detection/correction code generation circuits.

Zulian also discloses a plurality of memory modules 11, 12, 13, 113, and 114, but these modules do not include a plurality of error detection/correction code generation circuits and a plurality of error detection/correction circuits like the plurality of modules as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Therefore, Zulian does not disclose any of the features as recited in claim 1.

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-9 as being unpatentable over Zulian and Watanabe. However, on page 3 of the Office Action, the

Examiner suggests that claim 1 is obvious in lieu of Zulian and Kikuchi et al. ("Kikuchi").

It appears that the citing of Kikuchi was a typographical error. However, it is described above that Zulian does not disclose any of the features as recited in claim 1. Therefore, albeit a combination of Zulian and Watanabe or Zulian and Kikuchi, none of the cited prior art references disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-9 (depending, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claims 1. For example, in contrast to Zulian, dependent claim 2 provides, "wherein the error detection/correction system switches over between error detection/correction codes to be used dependent upon on a phase of transmitting an address, a command, and data." The Examiner relies on column 17, lines 49 through column 18 of Zulian. However, nothing in column 17, lines 49 through column 18 of Zulian discloses the claimed features of the error detection/correction system switching over between error detection/correction codes to be used dependent upon on a phase of transmitting an address, a command, and data (see claim 2).

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. NEW CLAIM

New independent claim 13 is added. Similar to independent claim 1, claim 13 provides "a plurality of modules connected via buses to transmit data, each of the modules including, a plurality of error detection/correction code generation circuits and a plurality of error detection/correction circuits." Therefore, claim 13 also patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/726,561

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-20-07

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501